## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS TEXARKANA DIVISION

TROY H. BRADFORD AND GLORIA BRADFORD, Individually and as Class Representatives on Behalf of All Similarly Situated Persons; and BOOKS ETC., by and through TROY AND GLORIA BRADFORD, Class Representatives on Behalf of All Those Similarly Situated;

**PLAINTIFFS** 

VS.

NO. 4:05-cv-4075 HFB

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, A Delaware Corporation,

**DEFENDANT** 

( Jury Trial Demanded)

## PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO PROHIBIT DEFENDANT COMMUNICATION WITH UNREPRESENTED PUTATIVE CLASS MEMBERS

COME NOW Plaintiffs, by and through counsel, and for Plaintiffs' Motion to Prohibit Defendant Communication with Unrepresented Putative Class Members state, allege, and say:

- 1. The train collision which is the subject of this suit occurred on October 15, 2005. The first Class Action Complaint concerning the collision was filed on October 19, 2005, in the Circuit Court of Miller County, Arkansas. Defendant has had notice of the existence of putative class members since on or about that date.
- 2. It has recently come to the attention of Plaintiffs' counsel that Defendant's communications with putative class members has included both those who are represented by counsel and those who are unrepresented. While Plaintiffs do not object to communications which Defendant may engage in with represented putative class members, through their counsel, Plaintiffs contend that Defendant, and its agents and employees, should be precluded from communicating

with unrepresented putative class members.

3, Defendant's communication with unrepresented class members has the substantial

risk of harming the potential class members. Prohibiting such communications would produce little,

if any, potential harm to Defendant. Allowing communication by Defendant with unrepresented

potential class members allows exploitation of those with lesser legal knowledge and complete

release of their potential claims after communicating solely with those with superior legal

knowledge and those having a conflict of interest with them.

4, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure was enacted to allow numerous

persons to pursue a class action or an action with questions of common or general interest to those

numerous parties. Settling of claims by unrepresented potential class members depletes the

potential class and undermines the purposes and intent of the drafters of Rule 23.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiffs pray, as requested in the Brief in

Support filed herewith, that their Motion to Prohibit Defendant Communication with Unrepresented

Putative Class Members be granted; that further communication by Defendant with any

unrepresented putative class member be prohibited; and for such other and further relief to which

Plaintiffs may be entitled in the premises.

Respectfully Submitted,

M. David Karnas

BELLOVIN & KARNAS, P.C.

100 North Stone Avenue, Suite 1105

Tucson, AZ 85701

Telephone: 520-571-9700

Telecopier: 520-571-8556

Email: karnas@bellovinkarnas.com

Roger W. Orlando

ORLANDO & KOPELMAN, P.C.

Decatur Court, Suite 400

315 West Ponce de Leon Avenue

Decatur, GA 30030

Telephone: 404-373-1800

Telecopier: 404-373-6999

Email: roger@orlandokopelman.com

Page 2

**DUNN, NUTTER & MORGAN, L.L.P.** 

Suite 6, State Line Plaza, Box 8030 Texarkana, Arkansas 71854-5945

Telephone: 870-773-5651 Telecopier: 870-772-2037

Email: rgnutter@dnmlawfirm.com

R. Gary Nutter

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

## **Attorneys for Defendants:**

George L. McWilliams Sean F. Rommel Patton Roberts McWilliams & Capshaw Century Plaza, Suite 400 2900 St. Michael Drive Texarkana, TX 75503

R. Gary Nutter